



93
B1 DFW

PATENT APPLICATION

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of

Docket No: Q60969

Hideo WATANABE, et al.

Appln. No.: 09/667,301

Group Art Unit: 3711

Confirmation No.: 1597

Examiner: Alvin A. HUNTER

Filed: September 25, 2000

For: SOLID MULTI-PIECE GOLF BALL

COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

ATTN: MAIL STOP ISSUE FEE

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

REMARKS

Applicants offer the following comments in response to the Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance set forth on page 2 of the Notice of Allowability dated November 30, 2005.

In the reasons for allowance, the Examiner contends that, based on the Board's decision of November 16, 2005, the phrase "composed primarily of a thermoplastic elastomer consisting of polyester, polyamide, polyolefin, and polystyrene" will be interpreted as "composed primarily of a thermoplastic elastomer consisting of a polyester elastomer, polyamide elastomer, polyolefin elastomer, and polystyrene elastomer." Notice of Allowability at page 2.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Board did not provide an interpretation of the above phrase in its decision. The Board merely stated that "Higuchi does not disclose that the mantle itself is formed of polyester polyol" and that "although Higuchi discloses that the polyurethane material used to form the mantle layer may have polyester added thereto, such is

not a teaching that the material that forms the mantle layer is composed primarily of polyester.”
Ex parte Watanabe, Appeal No. 2005-1652, at page 4.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that each claim is patentable based on its own language and not based on any paraphrasing or addition of language that may have been made by the Examiner.

Patent Office personnel are requested to note that the present submission does not adversely affect the patent term adjustment accrued by the Applicants to date. As emphasized in the “Clarification of 37 C.F.R. §1.704(c)(10) – Reduction of Patent Term Adjustment for Certain Types of Papers Filed After a Notice of Allowance Has Been Mailed,” 1247OG111 (6/26/01), “a response to the examiner’s reasons for allowance” is an example of a paper that does “not cause substantial interference and delay in the patent issue process” and is “not considered a ‘failure to engage in reasonable efforts’ to conclude processing or examination of the application.” Therefore, the Applicants remain entitled to the full patent term adjustment set forth on page 3 of the Notice of Allowance dated November 30, 2005.

Respectfully submitted,



Bhaskar Kakarla
Registration No. 54,627

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: February 16, 2006